



JOINT ANTELOPE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Citizen's Committee Meeting

August 24, 2004

Meeting Began at: 9:35 a.m.

Board Members Present:

Glenn Johnson

Citizen's Committee Members Present:

Delores Lintel, Mike Morosin, Beth Thacker,
Jim Christo, Robert Campbell. James Cook,
Randy Stramel

Citizen's Committee Members Absent:

Pam Manske, James Mastera

Others Present:

Amy Cornelius-Jones, Wynn Hjernstad, Kent Seacrest,
Wayne Teten, Bruce Sweney, Shannon Paul,
Jennifer Dam, Steve Henrichsen

Order No. 04-01 -

Call Meeting to Order -

Glenn Johnson called the meeting to order.

Order No. 04-02 -

Review of Draft Redevelopment Plan

Wynn Hjernstad began by stating that all three Mayor's Committees have met and signed off on the plan. The meetings have all been very positive and no recommendation for changes have taken place. There have been some editing to correct typos and the like. The purpose of this meeting is for the members of the Citizens Committee to review and offer a formal decision of the Redevelopment Plan. The next steps in the approval process is presentation to the JAVA Board, the Planning Commission, the Mayor and finally approval and adoption by the City Council.

Kent Seacrest gave a Power Point presentation of the highlights of the Draft Redevelopment Plan. [Highlights Attached - a hard copy of the full document is available for viewing at Engineering Services, 531 Westgate Blvd., suite 100]. An executive summary of the document should be available within the next few weeks. Seacrest is asking for the Citizens Committee's blessing on the plan. We will be working closely with the Downtown Master Plan Consulting Team with in the next 30 days. One concept that is being discussed will be the vision for 'O' Street (from 17th St. to at least the Waterway through to 27th St.). The questions to be answered is what type of character does 'O' Street have? (Main Street, Auto oriented, Retail) The Redevelopment Plan is leaning towards a Main Street vision.

Bob Campbell asked if anything came from the East Downtown meeting. Seacrest replied that most were interested in the process of the PUD (Planned Unit Development) Design Standards. Randy Stramel suggested a different order to some of the slides in the presentation. Delores Lintel asked if the Whittier Study has any impact on the role of the Citizen's Committee. Seacrest indicated that the Whittier Committee has recommended that the most logical use for the facility is to restore it to an educational facility. He sees the Citizen's Committee as being the guardian angels for this project and help the project move forward.

Jim Christo asked if this power point presentation would be available to the public. Seacrest said that the presentation needs some editing but would be on the web soon.

Jim Cook asked about the new regulatory requirements and how it impacts the community.

Steve Henrichsen from Planning briefly discussed some of the design standards related to the Redevelopment Plan. It is being proposed to develop two different sets of standards; one for residential and one for commercial.

Residential: There is already a set of Neighborhood Design Standards for residential areas. One set of standards that is being proposed was prepared by RTKL November 2003. The community probably would not be interested in lengthy regulations. What is being proposed is a 6-7 page document that includes illustrations and briefly details standards such as windows, entrances, number of levels, porches, placement of garages, etc. The purpose is to fit in with the adjacent neighborhoods.

Commercial: The idea is to start in the central Antelope Valley area with the design standards and then apply those standards throughout the rest of the project area. A Zoning Overlay District, called the PUD, is being planned. A PUD (Planned Unit Development) is added to the existing zoning. Through the PUD, adjustments can be made to the zoning regulations and regulations can be added as well as be loosened up. These general regulations would be applicable to all zones and would match up to what the Redevelopment Plan shows and what types of uses we should have for the area. The PUD will also address building style for the area.

Delores Lintel stated that in order to facilitate the redevelopment, we are dependent on the PUD. She wanted to know what would happen if there was opposition to these standards? Henrichsen responded that the City Council has the ultimate authority on the standards and we need to work with the City Council, Planning Commission neighborhoods and business owners to come to a consensus. It is not for staff to decide if they like the design or not, if the owner meets the design requirements, they obtain their building permit and move forward. All existing developed properties would be grand-fathered. Seacrest addressed Lintel's question by stating that the Citizen's Committee has the opportunity to be a major facilitator in the Redevelopment Plan. There is an additional opportunity to the committee members to be at Planning Commission and City Council to communicate that involvement has only been about eight years and you can facilitate to opponents that it does not have to be exactly one way. Morosin pointed out that some neighborhoods are concerned about the "slip-ins". Beth Thacker inquired about the use and standards of signage and advertising. Henrichsen said that signage is being addressed and the possibility of canopy signs, wall signs, no billboards or pole signs, etc. Stramel asked about the timing of the PUD. Henrichsen stated that the current plan is for the PUD to immediately follow the Redevelopment Plan. Stramel asked who is ultimately responsible for the PUD. Henrichsen responded that the City Council adopts the PUD, but the Planning Department administers it. Stramel asked how the committee is to respond to questions about the PUD. Henrichsen replied that the PUD is a change in zoning. The City requires that letters will be sent to all property owners with the PUD area informing them of any changes to the zoning. Public information meetings would be held with the property owners and the general public. The revision to the PUD rules and process has been approved by the Planning Commission and is now at City Council. The revised

Order No. 04-03 -

PUD will make the process more simple to use and streamlined. Lintel voiced concerns about Granny Flats in the neighborhoods. Henrichsen said that Granny Flats would be a separate action and the neighborhoods would have input.

Discussion of the Future Role of the JAVA Citizen's Committee Members

Group discussion of the Citizen Committee's roles. Jim Cook posed the idea of the JAVA Board to re-look at the role of the Citizen's Committee and how they can best serve and be utilized. He sees the Committee as being an interface between the Board and the neighborhoods. Cook also suggested that the committee be given a small budget to work with for educating the community about the Antelope Valley projects. Mike Morosin brought up concerns regarding the availability of parcels for moving houses. Seacrest stated the Preservation Infill Program, which details the guidelines and standards, for the Redevelopment Plan will most likely be amended. We currently just have concepts and they are not yet considered projects. The funds have been budgeted for moving houses into new lots, but all of the details have not yet been clearly worked out. Wynn Hjermsstad stated that one of roles of the Citizens Committee is to provide oversight. Cook suggested that a neighborhood round table would be a good opportunity to provide some education.

Stramel inquired about the \$75m Bond Issue and how it relates to the Antelope Valley Projects. Henrichsen said that the Bond Issue is really a 6 year CIP issues and different City staff would need to address that topic. Stramel indicated that the public has a perception of correlation and requests an additional meeting so that the committee members have a better understanding of all the various funds. Wayne Teten added that the Bond Issue does not include the Antelope Valley Projects and there is a list of projects that it does include. Seacrest clarified that the CIP is a visionary document of future plans.. A meeting has been scheduled for September 2, 2004 at 2:00 p.m. at Engineering Services.

Glenn Johnson asked for a letter from the Citizen's Committee indicating approval of the Redevelopment Plan.

Meeting adjourned at approximately 11:25 a.m.